

EXHIBIT 7

From: robin.cheng@glacier.law <robin.cheng@glacier.law>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:54 PM
To: Neil Nandi <nnandi@loeb.com>
Cc: Adam Kelly <akelly@loeb.com>; Tao 聽Liu <tao.liu@glacier.law>; Tom. 聽M <ruoting.men@glacier.law>
Subject: Re: RE: 20-cv-4806 - Meet and Confer re Urbanmax

This email originated from outside of Loeb's Network.

Subject to FRE 408

Neil,

Urbanmax is not interested in resubmitting an affidavit at this point.
Urbanmax will appeal the preliminary injunction order and seek damage accordingly.

Regards,

Robin Cheng | Attorney
Glacier Law PLLC
200 Park Avenue, Suite 1703
New York, NY 10166
www.glacier.law
Tel: +1 (332) 208-8882
Fax: +1 (312) 801-4587

Privilege and Confidentiality Notice

This email is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential, proprietary, or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, review, dissemination, copying or action taken based on this message or its attachments, if any, prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by replying this email and destroy or delete all copies of the original message and any attachment. Thank you.

From: [Neil Nandi](#)
Date: 2021-05-25 17:15
To: robin.cheng@glacier.law
CC: [Adam Kelly](#); [Tao Liu](#); [Tom. M](#)
Subject: RE: RE: 20-cv-4806 - Meet and Confer re Urbanmax
Robin,

We reviewed the affidavit that Urbanmax filed this morning. It differs in several material ways from the affidavit we had discussed. Specifically, in Paragraph 3 of the joint status report filed by Plaintiffs and Urbanmax (Dkt. 237), the parties state that the affidavit would state that Urbanmax is not “related to or affiliated with Gyroor-US in any way” and “not acting in concert or participation with Gyroor-US or a related or affiliated entity.”

The affidavit Urbanmax filed however, does not address: (1) being “**related to**” Gyroor-US “**in any way**”; (2) “**acting in concert or participation**”; and (3) any interactions or affiliations with entities that are “**related or affiliated**” with Gyroor-US. Instead, the affidavit Urbanmax filed is narrowly focused on Urbanmax’s “affiliat[ion]” with the specific “Gyroor-US” entity and its specific corporate owner (as stated in the affidavit).

We respectfully request that Urbanmax submit a new affidavit that covers everything the parties had agreed to. Please let us know if you would like us to provide proposed language for the affidavit, to avoid any further issues. We have not yet served Urbanmax and, as a courtesy, we can refrain from doing so for the time being to permit Urbanmax the opportunity to correct. Plaintiffs do not require that the affidavit be filed with the Court (simply emailing us the signed affidavit is fine), though we respectfully request that the certification line also be updated to reflect the language from 28 U.S.C. 1746: “I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.” That is to say, we request that the knowledge qualifier be removed.

Thank you very much. We are happy to discuss if needed.

Best,

Neil